2000P4162

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING OR FAX TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

By: Kongfung Chen Date: April 19, 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applic. No.	:	09/901,550 Confirmation No. 7121
Applicant	:	Knut Kahlisch et al.
Filed	:	July 9, 2001
TC/A.U.	:	2815
Examiner	:	Chris C. Chu
Title:	:	Support Matrix with Bonding Channel for Integrated Semiconductors, and Method for Producing it
Docket No.	:	2000P4162
Customer No.	:	24131
Appeal No.	:	**2005-0234**

Arguments in Support of Oral Hearing

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

S i r :

In support of the Oral Hearing dated April 19, 2005, kindly consider the following remarks:

Remarks:

The following remarks rely upon argument that has been relied upon in the Brief on Appeal or Reply Brief.

Claims 1-7 and 11 are rejected and are under appeal. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent and are rejected as being anticipated by Wiech. Since claims 2-5 stand or fall with claim 1 and claim 7 stands or falls with claim 6, the following discussion is only directed to the patentablity of claims 1, 6, and 11.

The key issue in this case is whether or not the reference Wiech discloses the feature that the groove (or "barrier") has a region with a parting agent disposed thereon for repelling the flowable material, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, and 11 of the instant application.

Appellants maintain that Wiech does not disclose this feature. Here is a summary of the main reasoning relied upon in the Brief on Appeal and the Reply Brief.

1. The examiner has stated that there is no structural difference between a "parting agent 10" of the invention of the instant application and the "conductor 24" provided at the bottom of recess 10 in Fig. 2 of Wiech.

The examiner has further stated that any material reads on a "parting agent."

The Examiner's statements are incorrect because the examiner has ignored the fact that the term "parting agent," be definition, implies that the parting agent material reduces the surface adhesion of the flowable material (for instance, silicone) on the surface of the support matrix. As already discussed in the Brief on Appeal and the Reply Brief, the wording "parting agent" is a well-known technical expression, which identifies substances that reduce the adhesiveness of a flowable material (for instance, silicone). Therefore, not any material reads on a "parting agent."

2. The examiner has stated that Appellants never specifically defined what material is used as the parting agent.

However, a specific recitation of concrete materials is neither adequate nor required since parting agents as such are known in the art. The invention of the instant application does not provide a new kind of parting agent material. Rather, the important concept of the invention of the instant application is to provide a parting agent

on a groove (or barrier) of a support matrix (rather than finding any new particular parting agent materials).

3. The examiner has stated that the conductive material 24 of Wiech is "capable of performing the intended use."

However, the conductive material 24 of Wiech cannot be used for repelling a flowable material from the support matrix surface. First, no flowable material is addressed in Wiech. Second, any flowable material covering the surface of the element 24 would also contact the groove or "barrier" 10 since the element 24 is located at the bottom of the "barrier" 10, not "disposed thereon," as recited in the claims of the instant application. Accordingly, the conductor line 24 is not capable of parting any flowable material from any region of the support matrix surface. Only the groove 10 itself might be able to part the flowable material therefrom. In the independent claims of the instant application, however, the combination of the barrier (or groove) and the parting agent is claimed.

4. Although parting agent may be conductive, the conductor 24 of Wiech is not a parting agent since it is not disclosed, either expressly, that the material of the

conductor 24 is a parting agent, or inherently, that the conductor 24 can reduce the adhesion of a flowable material. It is noted that: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP 2131. Therefore, Wiech does not describe, either expressly or inherently, a parting agent.

5. Due to the combined effect of the groove and the parting agent, a flowable material is more efficiently prevented from creeping across the support matrix surface. For instance, all inner walls of the groove may be coated with the parting agent. As a consequence, when the flowable material reaches the groove, the parting agent will prevent propagation of the flowable material on the inner sidewall of the groove. The combination of the edge of the groove and the parting agent provided on the inner sidewall of the groove prevent the flow of a flowable material more efficiently than a parting agent provided on a planar support matrix surface. The combined affect of preventing propagation results from the fact that at the edge of the groove propagation of the flowable material is stopped due to the recessed surface geometry and that propagation of the flowable

material onto the upper edge of the inner sidewall of the groove is blocked by the parting agent provided thereon.

For the above reasons as well as the reasons presented in the Brief on Appeal and the Reply Brief, the honorable Board is therefore respectfully urged to reverse the rejections of the Primary Examiner and to remand the application to the

Respectfully submitted,

Yonghong Chen
Reg. No. 56,150
For Appellants

YC

April 19, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101